



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/669,709	09/26/2000	Randy C. Willig	P04362	5496
34456	7590	08/26/2004	EXAMINER	
TOLER & LARSON & ABEL L.L.P. 5000 PLAZA ON THE LAKE STE 265 AUSTIN, TX 78746			MAIS, MARK A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2664	9

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/669,709

Applicant(s)

WILLIG, RANDY C.

Examiner

Mark A Mais

Art Unit

2664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-42 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-42 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The supplemental drawings were received on 01 June 2004. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities: it refers back to itself (i.e., "The system as claimed in Claim 32"). Examiner has interpreted claim 32 to refer back to claim 31. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 22-23, 25-26, 30-31, 32, 34-35, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miloslavski et al (USP 6,477,565) in view of Newman et al. (USP 6,757,551).
5. With regard to claims 22-23, 25-26, and 30, Miloslavski et al. discloses a portable device comprising:

a display screen module comprising a display screen (for example, Fig. 1, display screen of notebook 29, col. 7, line 63); and

Art Unit: 2664

a user control module comprising:

a radio frequency (RF) transceiver (**Fig. 1, WAP device 29, col. 5, lines 56-57; see also col. 6, lines 3-7 wherein WAP device 29 can be a cell phone, laptop, palm (PDA), pager, etc.; see also col. 5, lines 63-67, wherein the radio frequency can be one of several RF technologies to include CDMA, TDMA, and GSM, etc.,**) to wirelessly communicate with a base station (**Fig. 1, WAP-SP 23 connected to WAP device 29 via wireless link 27, col. 8, lines 4-7; wherein said RF transceiver transmits IP data packets to said base station (Fig. 1, WAP device 29) and receives IP data packets from said base station (transmits IP packets for at least Internet Protocol Telephony, col. 7, lines 60-63; as well WEB browsing, col. 2, lines 52-67) coupled to a(n IP) network (Fig. 1, Internet network 11, a data packet network, col. 5, lines 15-17); and a controller to:**

execute an Internet browser application (**WAP-enabled devices, such as WAP device 29 in Fig. 1, employ WEB-browsers, col. 2, lines 52-67)** so as to display web page content (**WEB pages, col. 5, lines 46-50)** on the display screen (**for example, Fig. 1, display screen of notebook 29, col. 7, line 63)** of the display screen module; and

communicate voice (and WEB page) data with the base station via the RF transceiver (**WAP 29 transmits and receives IP telephone calls, col. 3, lines 31-33; col. 8, lines 37-41; col. 7, lines 60-63; see also Fig. 2, WAP III, col. 11, lines 15-24).**

Furthermore, WAP 9, when employing IP telephony, must, inherently, have a microphone and speaker, (e.g., a cell phone or a laptop capable of sending and receiving VOIP packets) (**Fig. 1, WAP device 29, col. 5, lines 56-57; see also col. 6, lines 3-7 wherein WAP device 29 can be a cell phone, laptop, palm (PDA), pager, etc.; see also col. 5, lines 63-67,**

wherein the radio frequency can be one of several RF technologies to include CDMA, TDMA, and GSM, etc.,).

Miloslavski et al. does not specifically disclose a removably attached display screen. However, Newman et al. discloses a personal communicator the combines the functions of a cell phone and a computer (**see Abstract**). More specifically, Newman et al. discloses a user control module (**Figs. 1 and 2, interpreted as the combination of the cell phone 1 and computer 4**) that can access the internet and retrieve e-mail or receive faxes (**col. 4, lines 2-5**). Moreover, Newman et al. discloses a detachable screen (**detachable screen 3, figs. 1 and 2**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the RF receiver coupled to the controller to a detachable screen because such a modification allows the user to use the appliance more easily and spares the user the inconvenience of carrying around all the separate components (**col. 4, lines 5-10**). Newman et al. also discloses that the user control module contains a microphone and speaker (**Fig. 2, microphone 8 (MIC.) and earpiece 6**).

6. With regard to claims 31-32, 34-35, and 39, Miloslavski et al. discloses a system comprising:
a base station (**Fig. 1, WAP-SP 23 connected to WAP device 29 via wireless link 27, col. 8, lines 4-7; wherein said RF transceiver transmits IP data packets to said base station (Fig. 1, WAP device 29) and receives IP data packets from said base station (transmits IP packets for at least Internet Protocol Telephony, col. 7, lines 60-63; as well WEB browsing, col. 2, lines 52-67) coupled to a(n IP) network (Fig. 1, Internet network 11, a data packet**

Art Unit: 2664

network, col. 5, lines 15-17); and a portable device comprising:

a display screen module comprising a display screen (for example, Fig. 1, display screen of notebook 29, col. 7, line 63); and

a user control module comprising:

a radio frequency (RF) transceiver (Fig. 1, WAP device 29, col. 5, lines 56-57; *see also* col. 6, lines 3-7 wherein WAP device 29 can be a cell phone, laptop, palm (PDA), pager, etc.; *see also* col. 5, lines 63-67, wherein the radio frequency can be one of several RF technologies to include CDMA, TDMA, and GSM, etc.) to wirelessly communicate with the base station (Fig. 1, WAP-SP 23 connected to WAP device 29 via wireless link 27, col. 8, lines 4-7; wherein said RF transceiver transmits IP data packets to said base station (Fig. 1, WAP device 29) and receives IP data packets from said base station (transmits IP packets for at least Internet Protocol Telephony, col. 7, lines 60-63; as well WEB browsing, col. 2, lines 52-67); and a controller to:

execute an Internet browser application (WAP-enabled devices, such as WAP device 29 in Fig. 1, employ WEB-browsers, col. 2, lines 52-67) so as to display web page content (WEB pages, col. 5, lines 46-50) on the display screen (for example, Fig. 1, display screen of notebook 29, col. 7, line 63) of the display screen module; and

communicate voice (and WEB page) data with the base station via the RF transceiver (WAP 29 transmits and receives IP telephone calls, col. 3, lines 31-33; col. 8, lines 37-41; col. 7, lines 60-63; *see also* Fig. 2, WAP III, col. 11, lines 15-24).

Furthermore, WAP 9, when employing IP telephony, must, inherently, have a microphone and speaker, (e.g., a cell phone or a laptop capable of sending and receiving VOIP

Art Unit: 2664

packets) (**Fig. 1, WAP device 29, col. 5, lines 56-57; see also col. 6, lines 3-7 wherein WAP device 29 can be a cell phone, laptop, palm (PDA), pager, etc.; see also col. 5, lines 63-67, wherein the radio frequency can be one of several RF technologies to include CDMA, TDMA, and GSM, etc.,**).

Miloslavski et al. does not specifically disclose a removably attached display screen. However, Newman et al. discloses a personal communicator the combines the functions of a cell phone and a computer (**see Abstract**). More specifically, Newman et al. discloses a user control module (**Figs. 1 and 2, interpreted as the combination of the cell phone 1 and computer 4**) that can access the internet and retrieve e-mail or receive faxes (**col. 4, lines 2-5**). Moreover, Newman et al. discloses a detachable screen (**detachable screen 3, figs. 1 and 2**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the RF receiver coupled to the controller to a detachable screen because such a modification allows the user to use the appliance more easily and spares the user the inconvenience of carrying around all the separate components (**col. 4, lines 5-10**). Newman et al. also discloses that the user control module contains a microphone and speaker (**Fig. 2, microphone 8 (MIC.) and earpiece 6**).

7. Claims 24, 33, and 42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miloslavski et al. in view of Newman et al. as applied to claims 22-23, 25-26, 30-31, 32, 34-35, and 39 above, and further in view of Borella et al. (USP 6,587,433).

Art Unit: 2664

8. With regard to claims 24, 33, and 42, neither Miloslavski et al. nor Newman et al. specifically disclose establishing a low latency IP connection for transceiving voice over IP data packets between the controller and the base station. However, Borella et al. discloses a voice over IP system over an IP network that utilizes a differentiated quality of service by using the TOS field in the IP header between a VOIP telephone and the IP network for transporting the voice IP packets (**col. 8, lines 44-51**). Specifically, Borella et al. discloses that the Internet Protocol uses the TOS field in the IP packet's header to define the type-of-service used for transceiving IP data packets wherein the precedence levels for low latency is known as minimizing delay (**See Tables A and B, col. 8, lines 52-59 and col. 9, lines 1-10, respectively; see also col. 8, line 60-67 and col. 9, lines 11-16; see also TC/IP Illustrated Vol. 1, pages 34-35**). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to establish a low latency connection between the controller and the base station to ensure the quality of service associated with voice communications.

9. Claims 27-29 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miloslavski et al. in view of Newman et al. as applied to claims 22-23, 25-26, 30-31, 32, 34-35, and 39 above, further in view of Borella et al. (USP 6,587,433) as applied to claims 3 and 12, and further in view of Newman et al.

10. With regard to claims 27-29, and 36-38, neither Miloslavski et al. nor Newman et al. specifically disclose that a low latency VoIP connection is established when the phone is separated from the display (and that, concurrently, the internet browser application is ceased).

Art Unit: 2664

Borella et al. discloses that the low latency connection is established by amending the TOS field for minimizing delay. Newman et al. teaches that the separation of the cell phone and the computer is necessarily determined because the mode of each device must be determined before each devices' use (**Specifically, Newman et al. discloses that the personal communicator device can operate in several different modes to include either cell phone or a computer/cell phone/display combination capable of accessing the internet (page 2, paragraph 17; see also page 3, paragraph 21 and 23). Newman et al., therefore, teaches that the cell phone separation from the computer is necessary in order to operate in the correct mode for each disclosed device (e.g., cell-phone-only mode) making it obvious that the controller would be able to determine when the display screen is separated because such a determination is necessary for either using the cell phone alone or using it in conjunction with the computer to access the internet (page 2, paragraph 17, lines 6-8)).** Thus, Newman et al. must determine when such a VOIP connection is feasible when using the cell phone. For example, when the cell phone is operating as part of an IP cell network for the use of packetized data voice communication (VOIP), the cell phone would automatically establish a low latency connection. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the telephone to establish a low latency connection for the VOIP telephone because the cell phone in Newman et al. would detect when it was separated form the screen and/or computer and, therefore, know when to establish the low latency VOIP connection (and, concurrently, ceasing the internet application). Moreover, since Newman et al. already discloses automatically establishing a VoIP connection when the controller is separated from the display screen, it would

Art Unit: 2664

also have been obvious to resume the execution of the Internet browser application when the controller is reattached to the display screen.

11. Claims 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miloslavski et al. in view of Newman et al. further in view of Borella et al.

12. With regard to claims 40-42, Miloslavski et al. discloses a method comprising:

displaying web page content on a display screen module (**for example, Fig. 1, display screen of notebook 29, col. 7, line 63**) of a portable device **Fig. 1, WAP device 29, col. 5, lines 56-57; see also col. 6, lines 3-7 wherein WAP device 29 can be a cell phone, laptop, palm (PDA), pager, etc.; see also col. 5, lines 63-67, wherein the radio frequency can be one of several RF technologies to include CDMA, TDMA, and GSM, etc.)** when the display screen module is attached to a user control module of the portable device. Newman et al. discloses a user control module (**Figs. 1 and 2, interpreted as the combination of the cell phone 1 and computer 4**) that can access the internet and retrieve e-mail or receive faxes (**col. 4, lines 2-5**). Moreover, Newman et al. discloses a detachable screen (**detachable screen 3, figs. 1 and 2**).

Neither Miloslavski et al. nor Newman et al. specifically disclose that, in response to a determination that the user control module and the display screen are separated, that a low latency VoIP connection is established when the phone is separated from the display and communicated between the portable device and the base station (**Fig. 1, WAP-SP 23 connected to WAP device 29 via wireless link 27, col. 8, lines 4-7; wherein said RF transceiver transmits IP data packets to said base station (Fig. 1, WAP device 29) and receives IP data**

Art Unit: 2664

packets from said base station (transmits IP packets for at least Internet Protocol Telephony, col. 7, lines 60-63; as well WEB browsing, col. 2, lines 52-67) wirelessly coupled to the portable device (via a RF transceiver, Fig. 1, WAP device 29, col. 5, lines 56-57; see also col. 6, lines 3-7 wherein WAP device 29 can be a cell phone, laptop, palm (PDA), pager, etc.; see also col. 5, lines 63-67, wherein the radio frequency can be one of several RF technologies to include CDMA, TDMA, and GSM, etc.) and that, concurrently, the internet browser application is ceased. Borella et al. discloses that the low latency connection is established by amending the TOS field for minimizing delay. Newman et al. teaches that the separation of the cell phone and the computer is necessarily determined because the mode of each device must be determined before each devices' use (Specifically, Newman et al. discloses that the personal communicator device can operate in several different modes to include either cell phone or a computer/cell phone/display combination capable of accessing the internet (page 2, paragraph 17; see also page 3, paragraph 21 and 23). Newman et al., therefore, teaches that the cell phone separation from the computer is necessary in order to operate in the correct mode for each disclosed device (e.g., cell-phone-only mode) making it obvious that the controller would be able to determine when the display screen is separated because such a determination is necessary for either using the cell phone alone or using it in conjunction with the computer to access the internet (page 2, paragraph 17, lines 6-8)).

Thus, Newman et al. must determine when such a voice packet connection is feasible when using the cell phone. For example, when the cell phone is operating as part of an IP cell network for the use of packetized data voice communication (VOIP), the cell phone would automatically establish a low latency connection. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2664

the art at the time of the invention for the telephone to establish a low latency connection for the VOIP telephone because the cell phone in Newman et al. would detect when it was separated from the screen and/or computer and, therefore, know when to establish the low latency VOIP connection (and, concurrently, ceasing the internet application). Moreover, since Newman et al. already discloses automatically establishing a VoIP connection when the controller is separated from the display screen, it would also have been obvious to resume the execution of the Internet browser application when the controller is reattached to the display screen to display web page content.

Response to Amendment/Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed June 1, 2014 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

14. Applicant argues that Newman et al. is improperly used as prior art. Newman et al. has matured into a patent (USP 6,757,551), thereby rendering applicant's argument moot. As a patent, Newman et al. qualifies as a 35 USC 102(e) reference, noted in Applicant's arguments and MPEP citation (page 8, paragraphs 3-5).

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

16. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A Mais whose telephone number is (703) 305-6959. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.


18. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on (703) 305-4366. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

19. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/669,709
Art Unit: 2664

Page 13

July 30, 2004



WELLINGTON CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600